



Evolving graphs and least cost journeys in dynamic networks

Binh-Minh Bui-Xuan, Afonso Ferreira, Aubin Jarry

► To cite this version:

Binh-Minh Bui-Xuan, Afonso Ferreira, Aubin Jarry. Evolving graphs and least cost journeys in dynamic networks. WiOpt'03: Modeling and Optimization in Mobile, Ad Hoc and Wireless Networks, Mar 2003, Sophia Antipolis, France. 10 p. inria-00466676

HAL Id: inria-00466676

<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00466676>

Submitted on 24 Mar 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Evolving graphs and least cost journeys in dynamic networks *

B. Bui Xuan[†]

A. Ferreira[‡]

A. Jarry[§]

Abstract

New technologies and the deployment of mobile and nomadic services are driving the emergence of complex communications networks, that have a highly dynamic behavior. This naturally engenders new route-discovery problems under changing conditions over these networks. In this paper, we use and extend a recently proposed graph theoretic model, which helps capture the evolving characteristic of such networks, in order to propose and formally analyze least cost *journeys* (the analog of paths in usual graphs) in a class of dynamic networks, where the changes in the topology can be predicted in advance. Cost measures investigated here are hop count (*shortest* journeys), arrival date (*foremost* journeys), and time span (*fastest* journeys).

1 Introduction

Infrastructure-less mobile communication environments, such as mobile ad-hoc networks and low earth orbiting (LEO) satellite systems, present a paradigm shift from back-boned networks, such as cellular telephony, in that data is transferred from node to node via peer-to-peer interactions and not over an underlying backbone of routers. Naturally, this engenders new problems regarding optimal routing of data under various conditions over these dynamic networks [21]. In this setting, the generalized case of network routing using shortest paths or least cost methods are complicated by the arbitrary movement of the mobile agents, thereby leading to variations in link costs and connectivity. This naturally motivates studying the modeling of such dynamics, and designing algorithms that take it into account [22].

Note, however, that for the case of sensor networks, LEO satellite systems and other mobile networks with predestined trajectories of the mobile agents, the network dynamics are somewhat deterministic. Therefore, since the trajectories of the satellites are known in advance, it is possible to exploit this determinism in optimizing routing strategies [8].

Another setting where the evolution of the network is known was studied in [7]. The authors cleverly brought the usual notion of competitive analysis ([2]) on a dynamic setting to the attention of the mobile communications community. It is used in order to analyze the quality of a protocol and its choices made forced by the evolution of the network. At the end of the process, the *history* of the network is formalized as a sequence of graph topologies on which the application can be solved optimally. The *merit* of the protocol is then the ratio of the solution cost found on-line over the optimal off-line cost.

Such networks where the topology dynamics are known at different time intervals are henceforth referred to as *fixed schedule dynamic networks* (FSDN's) (see Figure 1).

Literature related to route discovery issues in dynamic networks started more than four decades ago, with papers dealing with operations of transport networks (e.g., [5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 20]). Recent work on time-dependent networks can be found in [9, 15, 16], where flow algorithms are studied in static networks with edge traversal times that may depend on the number of flow units traversing it at a given moment. If traversal times are discrete, then the approach proposed in [10], namely of expanding the original graph into layers representing the time steps (also called space-time approach), may work for computing several path-related problems (see [9, 15, 16] and references therein). This approach, generalized in [19], requires a discrete set T of time steps such that all the edge creations and deletions occur in T , and such that when using an edge at time $t \in T$, the arrival time $t + d$ (where d is the delay of the edge we used) is also in T . This can generally not be applied if we want T to have a reasonable (not exponential) size. For

*This work was partially supported by the COLOR action *Dynamic* and the European FET project CRESCCO.

[†]ENS-Lyon, 46, allée d'Italie, 69007 Lyon, France.

[‡]CNRS - I3S & INRIA Sophia Antipolis, 2004, Rt. des Lucioles, 06902 Sophia Antipolis Cedex, France. Afonso.Ferreira@sophia.inria.fr.

[§]I3S & INRIA Sophia Antipolis, 2004, Rt. des Lucioles, 06902 Sophia Antipolis Cedex, France. Aubin.Jarry@sophia.inria.fr.

2 Graph Theoretic Model

A dynamic network can be seen as a – potentially infinite – sequence $\mathcal{N} = \dots, \mathcal{N}_{t-1}, \mathcal{N}_t, \mathcal{N}_{t+1}, \dots$ of networks over time. The dynamic networks considered here are FSDNs, i.e., they have predictable changes in their topologies. We show here a corresponding graph theoretic model.

Definition 1 (Evolving Graphs) *Let be given a graph $G(V, E)$ and an ordered sequence of its subgraphs, $\mathcal{S}_G = G_1, G_2, \dots, G_T$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^T G_i = G$. Then, the system $\mathcal{G} = (G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ is called an evolving graph.*

Let $E_{\mathcal{G}} = \bigcup E_i$, and $V_{\mathcal{G}} = \bigcup V_i$. We denote $M = |E_{\mathcal{G}}|$ and $N = |V_{\mathcal{G}}|$. Two vertices are said to be *adjacent in \mathcal{G}* if and only if they are adjacent in some G_i . The degree of a vertex in \mathcal{G} is defined as its degree in $E_{\mathcal{G}}$. Like usual graphs, evolving graphs can be weighted, the weights on the edges representing traversal distance, traversal cost, etc. On the other hand, weights can also belong to the time domain (in this paper, we denote it $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$). In this case, we shall speak of *timed* evolving graphs because the weights on the edges will represent their traversal time. Let $\mathcal{I} = [t_1, t_{T+1}[\subset \mathbb{T}$ be a *time interval*, where G_i is the subgraph in place during $[t_i, t_{i+1}[$.

Throughout this text we shall consider packet networks. Hence, transmitting one piece of information means transmitting one packet over one edge. The duration of transmitting one packet over a link in a FSDN is given as a function ζ representing the links' traversal times.

Journeys We call *route in \mathcal{G}* a path $R = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k$ with $e_i \in E_{\mathcal{G}}$ in G . Let $R_{\sigma} = \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k$ with $\sigma_i \in \mathbb{T}$ be a time schedule indicating when each edge of the route R is to be traversed. We define a *journey $\mathcal{J} = (R, R_{\sigma})$* if and only if R_{σ} is in accordance with R , ζ , \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{I} , i.e., \mathcal{J} allows for a traversal from u to v in \mathcal{G} . Note, for instance, that journeys cannot go to the past.

A *round journey* is a journey $\mathcal{J} = (R, R_{\sigma})$ in \mathcal{G} , where R is a cycle in G . It is the analogous to a usual circuit in a graph, with the difference that once the round journey ends back in $u \in G_k$, for some k , nothing implies the existence of another time schedule allowing to use the same route again.

Distances The definitions above give rise to at least three different quality measures of journeys, namely hop-count or length, arrival date, and journey time, two of which are in the time domain.

Let $\mathcal{J} = (R, R_{\sigma})$ be a journey where $R = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k$ and $R_{\sigma} = \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k$. Then, The *hop-count* or *length* of \mathcal{J} is defined as $|\mathcal{J}|_h = |R| = k$. It is also denoted $h(\mathcal{J})$. The *distance* in \mathcal{G} between two vertices u and v is defined as $d(u, v) = \min\{|\mathcal{J}|_h\}$, taken over all journeys in \mathcal{G} between u and v . We shall say that one such journey is the *shortest*.

The *arrival date* of \mathcal{J} is defined as $|\mathcal{J}|_a = \sigma_k + \zeta(e_k)$, i.e., the scheduled time for the traversal of the last edge in \mathcal{J} , plus its traversal time. It is also denoted $a(\mathcal{J})$. The *earliest arrival date* in \mathcal{G} between two vertices u and v is given by the first journey arriving at v from u , denoted $a(u, v)$. We shall say that one such journey is the *foremost*. If there is no journey in \mathcal{G} between u and v , we say that $a(u, v) = \infty$.

The *journey time* of \mathcal{J} is defined as the elapsed time between the departure and the arrival, i.e. $|\mathcal{J}|_t = |\mathcal{J}|_a - \sigma_1$. It is also denoted $t(\mathcal{J})$. The *delay* in \mathcal{G} between two vertices u and v is defined as $delay(u, v) = \min\{|\mathcal{J}|_t\}$, taken over all journeys in \mathcal{G} between u and v . We shall say that one such journey is the *fastest*. If there is no journey in \mathcal{G} between u and v , we say that $delay(u, v) = \infty$.

Dynamics Corresponding to each edge e in $E_{\mathcal{G}}$ (respectively, node v in $V_{\mathcal{G}}$) we can define an *edge presence schedule $P_E(e)$* (respectively, *node presence schedule $P_V(v)$*) as a set of intervals indicating the subgraphs in which they are present, and possibly some of its parameters during each interval. Thus, we may alternatively define an evolving graph as $\mathcal{G} = (V_{\mathcal{G}}, E_{\mathcal{G}})$, where each node and edge has a schedule defined for it. An edge e and a schedule σ are valid in a journey, if and only if e is present at least in the interval $[\sigma; \sigma + \zeta(e)]$. To simplify our computations, it is safe to assume that the intervals of presence of an edge e are closed and that they are longer than $\zeta(e)$.

With the help of these edge and node schedules, we can now introduce ways to measure how much an evolving graph changes its topology during the time interval \mathcal{I} . First, we define the *activity of a vertex v* as $\delta_V(v) = |P_V(v)|$, and the *activity of an edge e* as $\delta_E(e) = |P_E(e)|$. We then define the *node activity* of an evolving graph as $\delta_V = \max\{\delta_V(v), v \in V_{\mathcal{G}}\}$, and the *edge activity* as $\delta_E = \max\{\delta_E(e), e \in E_{\mathcal{G}}\}$. The *activity of an evolving graph* is defined as $\delta = \max(\delta_V, \delta_E)$. And the *dynamics of an evolving graph* is defined as $\frac{(\delta-1)}{\mathcal{T}}$. As a consequence, since usual graphs have $\delta = 1$, they have dynamics zero.

Coding In this paper, we assume that the input \mathcal{G} is given as linked adjacency lists, with the sorted edge schedule attached to each neighbor, given as time intervals indicating when that edge is alive. The traversal time of that edge is also attached to the corresponding neighbor. The head of each list is a vertex with its own sorted node schedule list attached, also given as time intervals (see Figure 3).




Figure 3: The data structure for coding a fixed-schedule dynamic network modeled by an evolving graph.

Thus, for each vertex v , and each edge e , the corresponding $P_V(v)$ and $P_E(e)$ are defined as sets of time intervals. This data structure is especially useful when considering networks with low *dynamics*, meaning there are few activations/desactivations on nodes and edges.

A Very Useful Function Below we give a standard function on timed evolving graphs which will be used in the remainder of this paper. Let consider an edge $(u, v) \in E_{\mathcal{G}}$ and a time instant t . We call $f((u, v), t)$ the function which gives, for each edge (u, v) , and each time instant t , the earliest moment after t where node u can transmit a message to v . If such a moment does not exist, f returns ∞ .

Notice that our data structure allows for a quick computation of the function f . Indeed, with a binary search, this computation can be done in $O(\log \delta_E)$.

3 Foremost Journeys

In this section we show how to compute foremost journeys from a source node s to all other nodes,

problem already studied several times in the literature, as shortest (time) path in time-dependent (transport) networks, e.g. in [5, 11, 13, 23]. Remind that, in order to compute shortest paths, the usual Dijkstra's algorithm [4] proceeds by building a set C of *closed* vertices, for which the shortest paths have already been computed, then choosing a vertex u not in C whose shortest path estimate, $d(u)$, is minimum, and adding u to C , i.e., closing u . At this point, all arcs from u to $V - C$ are *opened*, i.e., they are examined and the respective shortest path estimate, d , is updated for all end-points. In order to have quick access to the best shortest path estimate, the algorithm keeps a min-heap priority queue Q with all vertices in $V - C$, with key d . Note that d is initialized to ∞ for all vertices but for s , which has $d = 0$.

The theorem below shows that there exist foremost journeys with prefix property in a timed evolving graph. Further below, Property 1 shows how such journeys help computing earliest journeys in a timed evolving graph.

Proposition 1 (Ubiquitous earliest journey)

Let s and v be two vertices in a given timed evolving graph \mathcal{G} . If there is a journey in \mathcal{G} linking s to v , then, among all journeys linking s to v , there exists at least one foremost journey such that all its prefix journeys are themselves foremost journeys. Such a journey is called ubiquitous foremost journey (UFJ).

Proof

Let $\mathcal{J} = (e_1, \dots, e_k, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$ be a journey from s to v . If the hop-count $|\mathcal{J}|_h = k$ of \mathcal{J} is greater than $N \times \delta_V + 1$, then there are two integers $i < j$, a vertex u and a time interval $[t_1, t_2]$ such that both e_i and e_j start from u , and both σ_i and σ_j are in $[t_1, t_2]$. In this case, we can produce $R' = e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}, e_j, \dots, e_k$ and $R'_\sigma = \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{i-1}, \sigma_j, \dots, \sigma_k$, so that $\mathcal{J}' = (R', R'_\sigma)$ is a journey from s to v with $|\mathcal{J}'|_h < |\mathcal{J}|_h$ and $|\mathcal{J}'|_a = |\mathcal{J}|_a$. Observe that if \mathcal{J} was an UFJ, then so is \mathcal{J}' . This means that the only relevant journeys for our problem contain at most $N \times \delta_V$ edges, and that if there is a UFJ, then there is an UFJ with less than $N \times \delta_V$ edges.

Now, let $\mathcal{J} = (e_1, \dots, e_k, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$ and $\mathcal{J}' = (e'_1, \dots, e'_{k'}, \sigma'_1, \dots, \sigma'_{k'})$ be two journeys from s to v . We say that $\mathcal{J} \leq_{\text{ubiquitous}} \mathcal{J}'$ if and only if:

1. $|\mathcal{J}|_a < |\mathcal{J}'|_a$ or
2. $|\mathcal{J}|_a = |\mathcal{J}'|_a$ and $\sigma_k < \sigma'_{k'}$ or
3. $|\mathcal{J}|_a = |\mathcal{J}'|_a$, there is i such that $\forall j > i, \sigma_j = \sigma'_j$ and $\sigma_i < \sigma'_i$.
4. $|\mathcal{J}|_a = |\mathcal{J}'|_a, \forall j, \sigma_j = \sigma'_j$.

Notice that $\leq_{\text{ubiquitous}}$ defines a total pre-order relation¹ over all the journeys from s to v . The space of relevant journeys from s to v is bounded in time and in space ($N \times \delta_V$) and closed (we consider closed intervals of presence), so it has a minimum. Observe that such a minimum is an UFJ, so this proves the existence of an UFJ from s to v . \square

We now point out how earliest arrival dates in an UFJ can be easily computed thanks to the function $f(e, t)$, which gives, for each edge $e = (u, v)$, and each time instant t , the earliest moment after t where node u can retransmit a message to its neighbor v .

Property 1 (Earliest arrival dates in an UFJ)

Let s and v be two distinct vertices in \mathcal{G} , and \mathcal{J} be an UFJ from s to v , with $k = |\mathcal{J}|_h \geq 1$. Let u be the vertex which immediately precedes v in $\mathcal{J} = (R(u), (u, v), R_\sigma(u), \sigma_k)$. Then $a(s, v) = f((u, v), a(s, u)) + \zeta(u, v)$.

3.1 Computing UFJs

Below, we give an efficient algorithm to compute the single-source UFJs in evolving graphs.

Algorithm 1 (UFJs)

Input : An evolving graph \mathcal{G} , a vertex $s \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$

Output : An array $t_{EAD}[v] \in \mathbb{T}$ which gives for each vertex $v \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$ the Earliest Arrival Date from s ; and an array $\text{father}[v] \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$ which gives for each vertex $v \neq s \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$ its father in the ubiquitous foremost journey tree.

Variables : A min-heap Q of vertices, sorted by the array t_{EAD} . The array t_{EAD} will be updated.

1. Initialize $t_{EAD}[s] \leftarrow 0$; and for all $v \neq s \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$, $t_{EAD}[v] \leftarrow \infty$. Initialize Q with only s in the root.
2. While $Q \neq \emptyset$ do:
 - (a) Extract u , the vertex at $\text{root}(Q)$, and close it.
 - (b) Delete $\text{root}(Q)$.
 - (c) Traverse the adjacency list of u , and for each open neighbor v do:
 - i. Let $t = f((u, v), t_{EAD}[u])$.
 - ii. If $t + \zeta(u, v) < t_{EAD}[v]$ then
Update $t_{EAD}[v] \leftarrow t + \zeta(u, v)$,
Update $\text{father}[v] \leftarrow u$ and
insert v in the Q if it was not there already.

¹I.e., transitive and reflexive.

(d) Update Q .

The foremost journey is found by backtracking the variable *father*. In case two successive time-labels differ by more than the corresponding ζ , this implies that the foremost journey yields a forced stay of the information in that vertex for a number of steps, until the connection is established to its successor.

The algorithm termination is clear. In each step of Loop 2, one vertex is closed and we never re-insert a closed vertex into the heap Q . Thus the loop is repeated at most N times, and the algorithm ends. The validity of the algorithm will be proved through the following lemma.

Lemma 1 For all vertices u in $V_{\mathcal{G}}$, $t_{EAD}[u] = a(s, u)$ when u is closed.

Proof

By induction on the set C of closed vertices. At the beginning, $C = \{s\}$ and $t_{EAD}[s] = 0 = a(s, s)$. The property holds.

Suppose that at some moment the algorithm has correctly computed C , and a vertex v is to be closed, i.e., the algorithm is at the moment just before closing v . Thus v has been inserted in the heap Q , so s and v are connected. Let \mathcal{J} be an UFJ from s to v . This journey links the vertex s inside of C to the vertex v outside of C . Let now v' be the first vertex in \mathcal{J} which is not in C , and u be the vertex which precedes immediately v' in \mathcal{J} (see Figure 3.1).




Figure 4: Validity of Algorithm 1: earliest arrival dates.

Since C has been correctly computed, then $t_{EAD}[u] = a(s, u)$. When u was closed, v' was inserted in the Q , and since v' is before v in the journey \mathcal{J} , $t_{EAD}[v'] \leq t_{EAD}[v]$ and clearly $v' = v$. Furthermore, Property 1 states that $a(s, v) = f((u, v), a(s, u))$, hence $t_{EAD}[v] = a(s, v)$. \square

For each closed vertex, the algorithm performs $O(\log \delta_E + \log N)$ operations per neighbor. Hence, the total number of operations is at most

$O(\sum_{v \in V_G} [|\Gamma(v)|(\log \delta_E + \log N)]) = O(M(\log \delta_E + \log N))$. A consequence of the above results is the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Algorithm 1 correctly computes UFJs from a source node s to all others nodes in $O(M(\log \delta_E + \log N))$ time.*

4 Shortest Journeys

In this section, we focus on the hop-count of journeys, which we want to minimize. We will again use an approach close to Dijkstra's algorithm [4], computing all the shortest journeys from a single vertex s to all the other vertices.

The difficulty stems from the edge traversal times, which again make that prefix of shortest journeys are not necessarily shortest (see Figure 5).




Figure 5: The shortest journey from s to its antipode takes 8 hops at time step 1, whereas there is a shortcut a time step 4 to the fourth point.

Nevertheless, we note that if the last edge, say (u, v) , of a shortest journey between vertex s and vertex v arrives at time t , then the prefix journey (going from s to u) is shorter than all the journeys from s to u ending *before* t . Therefore, we will consider certain pairs $(u, t) \in V_G \times \mathbb{T}$ and compute the shortest journeys from s to vertex u arriving *before* time t . In this manner, the prefix property is respected, that is, a prefix of a shortest journey will be shortest, under the condition that it arrives before some time step t' . Using this property, we will build a tree of journeys between s and pairs (u, t) , in which each vertex u appears at least once (see Figure 6).




Figure 6: Tree of shortest paths.

In order to proceed, we introduce Algorithm 2, below. Given an array t_{LBD} (indexed on $u \in V_G$) of Lower Bound on Departure times $t_{LBD}[u] \in \mathbb{T}$, it computes an array e_{min} and an array t_{min} (indexed on $v \in V_G$) of edges $e_{min}[v] \in E_G$ and schedules $t_{min}[v] \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $e[v] = (u, v)$ exists during the whole $[t_{min}[v], t_{min}[v] + \zeta(e_{min}[v])]$ time interval; and such that $t_{LBD}[u] \leq t_{min}[v]$. Moreover, the couple $(e_{min}[v], t_{min}[v])$ is chosen so that $t_{min}[v] + \zeta(e_{min}[v])$ is minimal over all possible couples, and we add the condition that $t_{min}[v] + \zeta(e_{min}[v]) \leq t_{LBD}[v]$. If no such couple exist, the default one is (nil, ∞) .

Algorithm 2 (Edge and schedule selection)

Input: A timed evolving graph \mathcal{G} and an array $t_{LBD}[u] \in \mathbb{T}$ which gives for each $u \in V_G$ a Lower Bound on Departure time.

Output : Two arrays $e_{min}[v] \in E_G$ and $t_{min}[v] \in \mathbb{T}$ which give for each $v \in V_G$ an edge $e_{min}[v] = (u, v)$ along with a schedule $t_{min}[v]$ for this edge.

Variable : An array $t_{arrival}[v] \in \mathbb{T}$ which gives the arrival date of the former edge ($t_{arrival} = t_{min} + \zeta(e_{min})$). The output array will vary.

1. For all $v \in V_G$ initialize $e_{min}[v] \leftarrow nil$; $t_{min}[v] \leftarrow \infty$ and $t_{arrival}[v] \leftarrow t_{LBD}[v]$.
2. For all (u, v) in E_G do:
 - (a) Let $t = f((u, v), t_{LBD}[u])$.
 - (b) If $(t + \zeta(u, v)) < t_{arrival}[v]$ then
 - i. Let $e_{min}[v] \leftarrow (u, v)$.
 - ii. Let $t_{min}[v] \leftarrow t$.
 - iii. Let $t_{arrival}[v] \leftarrow t + \zeta(u, v)$.

Now, observe that given a shortest journey with hop-count k , all its prefixes have a hop-count smaller than $k-1$. Our algorithm will compute all the arrival dates with hop-count $k-1$, and then proceed for hop-count k . The algorithm stops when all vertices have an arrival date smaller than ∞ , and keeps track of the first time when a vertex was encountered and its shortest path from s . The number of iterations in our algorithm is of course the eccentricity of \mathcal{G} .

Algorithm 3 (Shortest journeys)

Input: A timed evolving graph \mathcal{G} , a vertex $s \in V_G$.

Output: An array $\mathcal{J}_{shortest}[v] \in \{\text{set of all journeys}\}$ which gives for each $v \in V_G$ a shortest journey from s to v .

Variables: An array $\mathcal{J}[v] \in \{\text{set of all journeys}\}$ which gives for each $v \in V_G$ a journey from s to v ; an array $t_{LBD}[u] \in \mathbb{T}$ which gives for each $u \in$

V_G a Lower Bound on Departure time; two arrays $e_{min}[v] \in E_G$ and $t_{min}[v] \in \mathbb{T}$ which give for each $v \in V_G$ an edge $e_{min}[v] = (u, v)$ along with a schedule $t_{min}[v]$ for this edge; and a number of hops $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

1. Initialize $t_{LBD}[s] \leftarrow 0$, $\mathcal{J}[s] \leftarrow ()$ and define $\mathcal{J}_{shortest}[s] = ()$; for all $v \neq s$ $t_{LBD}[v] \leftarrow \infty$ and $\mathcal{J}[v] \leftarrow ()$; $k \leftarrow 0$.
2. While there is $v \in V_G$ such that $t_{LBD}[v] = \infty$ and
While $k < N$ do:
 - (a) $k \leftarrow k + 1$
 - (b) Call Algorithm 2 with input (\mathcal{G}, t_{LBD}) , and store the results in the arrays e_{min} and t_{min} .
 - (c) For each vertex $v \in V_G$ do:
 - If $e_{min}[v] \neq nil$ then
 - i. Let $e_{min}[v] = (u, v)$.
 - ii. Let $(R, R_\sigma) = \mathcal{J}[u]$.
 - iii. Update $\mathcal{J}[v] \leftarrow (R, e_{min}[v], R_\sigma, t_{min}[v])$.
 - iv. If $t_{LBD}[v] = \infty$ then define $\mathcal{J}_{shortest}[v] = \mathcal{J}[v]$.
 - v. Update $t_{LBD}[v] \leftarrow t_{min}[v] + \zeta(e_{min}[v])$.

Proposition 2 *The algorithm above computes shortest journeys from a single source s to all the vertices in \mathcal{G} , if such journeys exist. If \mathcal{G} is connected, then the complexity of the algorithm is $O(Md \log \delta_E)$, where d is the eccentricity of s . If \mathcal{G} is not connected the complexity of the algorithm is $O(NM \log \delta_E)$*

Proof

For each k , all the edges are processed, and the retrieval of arrival dates takes $O(\log \delta_E)$, so the overall complexity for a value of k is $O(M \log \delta_E)$. We will prove by induction that for each k , the earliest arrival date with k hops is computed for the couple $(s, v), \forall v \in V_G$. So the overall complexity is $O(Md \log \delta_E)$, where d is the eccentricity of s , if \mathcal{G} is connected. In case \mathcal{G} is not connected, the algorithm will stop because $k > N$ at step 2. In this case, the overall complexity is $O(NM \log \delta_E)$. \square

5 Fastest Journeys

In this section, we are interested in the *journey time* measure, and we will compute fastest journeys from s to all the other vertices. This problem is much more complex than the two former ones, because a

faster journey may appear well ahead in time, or can be really long compared to the shortest journeys. Moreover, the speed of a journey prefix is almost irrelevant regarding the speed of the whole journey. Indeed, a fast prefix may well imply a long waiting time, offsetting the apparent gain in speed. On the other hand, some prefix journeys are too slow and hence useless to our computations. The remaining prefixes will be grouped within classes of *relevant* journeys.

As in Section 4, we will proceed hop by hop, since the number of hops in a fastest journey is also bounded by N . For each k , we will build a list of relevant journey classes of length k starting in s , by taking the list for hop-count $k - 1$ and extending its relevant journey classes to k hops. This is done by examining each edge of the graph, building the journeys classes that can go through this edge, and then eliminating irrelevant journey classes. After N hops, we know that the fastest journeys are included in the final relevant journey class list. Therefore it suffices to search for the minimum journeys in this list to obtain the requested fastest journeys. The number of relevant classes is bounded by the size of \mathcal{G} , and thus the complexity of our algorithm remains reasonable.

For each journey, the measure of quality (the journey time) is different from the hop-count, and from the arrival date. We will not keep track of the hop-count, which is implicit in our algorithm. We will however use it to stop the algorithm (after hop-count $N - 1$). Regarding the two other parameters, we will keep track at each step of several possible journeys from the source s to some vertex v , along with the arrival date $t_{arrival}$ of each journey and the journey time t_{speed} of each journey. Given two journeys from s to v with departure date $t_{departure_1}, t_{departure_2}$ and arrival dates $t_{arrival_1}, t_{arrival_2}$, observe that if we have both $t_{departure_1} \geq t_{departure_2}$ and $t_{arrival_1} \leq t_{arrival_2}$, then not only journey 1 starts after journey 2, but journey 1 arrives before journey 2. In this case journey 2 is useless for our problem, so we will keep track only of journey 1.

Definition 2 (Relevance) *Let \leq_{route} be an arbitrary order on the routes in G . Let \leq_{rel} be an order on the journeys of \mathcal{G} defined as follows.*

1. (on speed) $\mathcal{J}_1 <_{rel} \mathcal{J}_2$ if $|\mathcal{J}_1|_t < |\mathcal{J}_2|_t$ or
2. (on hop-count) $\mathcal{J}_1 <_{rel} \mathcal{J}_2$ if $|\mathcal{J}_1|_t = |\mathcal{J}_2|_t$ and $|\mathcal{J}_1|_h < |\mathcal{J}_2|_h$ or
3. (on \leq_{route}) $\mathcal{J}_1 = (R_1, R_{\sigma_1}) \leq_{rel} \mathcal{J}_2 = (R_2, R_{\sigma_2})$ if $|\mathcal{J}_1|_t = |\mathcal{J}_2|_t$ and $|\mathcal{J}_1|_h = |\mathcal{J}_2|_h$ and $R_1 \leq_{route} R_2$.

Definition 3 (Relevant & Irrelevant journeys)

Let \mathcal{G} be a timed evolving graph, and $u, v \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$. Let \mathcal{J} be a journey from u to v , with departure time $t_{\text{departure}}$ and arrival time t_{arrival} . If there is another journey \mathcal{J}' from u to v which starts at $t'_{\text{departure}}$ and arrives at t'_{arrival} such that $\mathcal{J}' \leq_{\text{rel}} \mathcal{J}$ and $[t_{\text{departure}}, t_{\text{arrival}}] \subset [t'_{\text{departure}}, t'_{\text{arrival}}]$, then \mathcal{J} is called irrelevant journey. Otherwise, \mathcal{J} is called relevant journey.

Another observation is that journeys with no *waiting time* in any vertex may yield a whole class of journeys with the same speed. To see this, consider two edges (u, v) and (v, w) . Let edge (u, v) have traversal time 3 and be valid at interval $[1, 8]$. Let edge (v, w) have traversal time 4 and be valid at interval $[5, 13]$. The journey $((u, v), (v, w), 3, 6)$ arrives takes 7 time steps to complete. But so do all journeys $((u, v), (v, w), [2, 5], [5, 8])$, as illustrated in Figure 7.




Figure 7: A journey and a class of similar journeys.

In order to handle this, given a journey $\mathcal{J} = (R, R_{\sigma})$ with $R = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k$ and $R_{\sigma} = \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k$, if each edge e_i is valid during interval $[\sigma_i, \sigma_i + \delta + \zeta(e_i)]$ for some $\delta \in \mathbb{T}$, then we introduce schedule intervals $I(R_{\sigma}, \delta) = [\sigma_1, \sigma_1 + \delta], [\sigma_2, \sigma_2 + \delta], \dots, [\sigma_k, \sigma_k + \delta]$ and we say that $(R, I(R_{\sigma}, \delta))$ is a *class of journeys*. Observe that for all $\epsilon \in [0, \delta]$, $(R, R_{\sigma} + \epsilon)$ is a journey. A journey class will be called *relevant journey class* if it contains only relevant journeys. A relevant journey class that is contained in no other relevant journey class will be called *maximal*

relevant journey class. We are interested in these maximal relevant journey classes.

Lemma 2 (Maximal relevant journey classes)

Given an evolving graph \mathcal{G} , two vertices $u, v \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the number of maximal relevant journey classes of k hops (or less) from u to v is bounded by the edges of \mathcal{G} and their activity, that is $2M\delta_E$.

Proof

Let us consider a maximal relevant journey class $(R, I(R_{\sigma}, \delta))$ of k hops (or less) from u to v . Let δ_{\max} be the biggest integer, such that $(R, I(R_{\sigma}, \delta_{\max}))$ is a journey class. If $\delta = \delta_{\max}$, then there is an edge $e_i \in R$ with schedule $\sigma_i \in R_{\sigma}$, such that $\sigma_i + \delta$ is the upper extremity of a presence interval of e_i . Clearly, no other relevant journey may use e_i during $[\sigma_i, \sigma_i + \delta]$. On the other hand, if $\delta_{\max} > \delta$, then there is a maximal relevant journey class $(R', I(R'_{\sigma}, \delta'))$ which is considered better than $(R, I(R_{\sigma}, \delta))$, that is $(R', R'_{\sigma}) <_{\text{rel}} (R, R_{\sigma})$ and $|(R', R'_{\sigma})|_a = |(R, R_{\sigma} + \delta)|_a$. In this case, there is an edge $e'_i \in R'$ and a schedule $\sigma'_i \in R'_{\sigma}$ such that σ'_i is the lower limit of a presence interval of e'_i . Clearly, no other relevant journey may arrive at $|(R, R_{\sigma} + \delta)|_a$. Thus, we can assign an extremity of an edge presence interval to each different maximal relevant journey class so that they are pairwise disjoint. Therefore, the number of maximal relevant classes is bounded by twice the number of edge presence intervals in $E_{\mathcal{G}}$. \square

Given an edge (u, v) and a list of journey classes arriving on vertex u , the first algorithm we give below computes a list of journey classes arriving on vertex v , such that each journey in the new classes is formed by an old journey plus the edge (u, v) scheduled as early as possible.

Algorithm 4 (Augmenting journey classes)

Input: A timed evolving graph \mathcal{G} ; an edge $(u, v) \in E_{\mathcal{G}}$; and a list L_u of journey classes from s to u .

We suppose that the list is ordered by increasing departure and arrival dates. Let $\text{first}(L_u)$ be the first element of the L_u . We will add and remove elements at the beginning of the list L_u .

Output: A list L_v of journey classes from s to v .

We add elements one by one to an empty list. Elements are added to the end of the list L_v .

Variables: A departure time for (u, v) : $\sigma(u, v) \in \mathbb{T}$; a maximum delay for the departure $\delta(u, v) \in \mathbb{T}$ so that a message can enter (u, v) during $[\sigma(u, v), \sigma(u, v) + \delta(u, v)]$; and a class of journeys $(R, I(R_{\sigma}, \delta))$. L_u will be emptied step by step, while L_v will be filled.

1. Initialize $L_v \leftarrow \emptyset$.

2. While L_u is not empty, do:

- (a) Let $(R, I(R_\sigma, \delta)) \leftarrow \text{first}(L_u)$ and Remove $(R, I(R_\sigma, \delta))$ from L_u .
- (b) Let $\sigma(u, v) \leftarrow f((u, v), |(R, R_\sigma)|_a)$ and If $\sigma = \infty$, then end the algorithm.
- (c) Let $[t_1, t_2]$ be the presence interval of (u, v) such that $\{t_1 \leq \sigma(u, v) \text{ and } \sigma(u, v) \leq t_2\}$ and
Let $\delta(u, v) \leftarrow (t_2 - \zeta(u, v))$.
- (d) If $(|(R, R_\sigma)|_a + \delta) \leq \sigma(u, v)$ then
 - i. $R_\sigma \leftarrow R_\sigma + \delta$.
 - ii. $\delta \leftarrow 0$.
 - iii. Add $(R, I(R_\sigma, \delta))$ to the end of the list L_v .
 - iv. Go to 2.
- (e) If $(|(R, R_\sigma)|_a < \sigma(u, v))$ then
 - i. Let $\delta_{\text{split}} = \sigma(u, v) - |(R, R_\sigma)|_a$.
 - ii. $R_\sigma \leftarrow R_\sigma + \delta_{\text{split}}$.
 - iii. $\delta \leftarrow \delta - \delta_{\text{split}}$.
- (f) If $(|(R, R_\sigma)|_a + \delta) > (\sigma(u, v) + \delta(u, v))$ then
 - i. Let $\delta_{\text{split}} = (\sigma(u, v) + \delta(u, v)) - (|(R, R_\sigma)|_a + \delta)$.
 - ii. Add the class $(R, I(R_\sigma + \delta_{\text{split}}, \delta - \delta_{\text{split}}))$ to the beginning of L_u .
 - iii. $\delta \leftarrow \delta_{\text{split}}$.
- (g) Add $(R, I(R_\sigma, \delta))$ to the end of the list L_v .

In order to proceed, we will need an algorithm that merges arriving journey class lists arriving on the same vertex v , while removing irrelevant journeys. This is a classical merge of ordered lists with a removal functionality, which we will denote Merge.

In the following, we give the main algorithm for fastest journeys.

Algorithm 5 (Fastest journeys)

Input: A timed evolving graph \mathcal{G} , a vertex $s \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Output: An array $\mathcal{J}_{\text{fastest}}[v] \in \{\text{set of journeys}\}$ which gives for each vertex $v \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$ a fastest journey from s to v .

Variables: Two vertices u and $v \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$; a hop-count k ; and two arrays $L[v], L'[v] \in \{\text{set of all journey class lists}\}$ which give for all $v \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$ a list of journey classes from s to v .

1. Initialize $L(s) \leftarrow ((\text{nil}, I(\text{nil}, \infty)))$ (A list with one element, the empty journey class with possible delay ∞). And for all $v \neq s$, let $L(v) \leftarrow \emptyset$.
2. For k from 1 to N do:

- (a) For each vertex $v \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$ do $L'[v] \leftarrow L[v]$.
 - (b) For each edge $(u, v) \in E_{\mathcal{G}}$ do
 - i. Call Algorithm 4 with input $(\mathcal{G}, (u, v), L[u])$ and output L_v .
 - ii. Merge $L'[v]$ with L_v , the output of the call to Algorithm 4, and place the resulting list in $L'[v]$.
 - (c) For each vertex $u \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$ do $L[u] \leftarrow L'[u]$.
3. For each vertex v , let $\text{fastest}(v) \leftarrow (R, R_\sigma)$, where $(R, I(R_\sigma, \delta))$ is the minimum for \leq_{rel} of $L(v)$.

Proposition 3 Algorithm 5 completes in $O(NM^2\delta_E)$ time steps.

Proof

According to Lemma 2 the number of maximal relevant journey classes is bounded by $2M\delta_E$. The calls for Algorithm 4 on an edge (u, v) cost the activity of (u, v) plus the size of the lists, that is $O(M\delta_E)$. The calls to the Merge algorithm cost each the size of the lists, that is $O(M\delta_E)$. Thus, for each vertex v , the computation of the lists and the merge procedures cost $O(\Gamma(V)M\delta_E)$, where $\Gamma(V)$ is the number of neighbors of v . Therefore, at each hop count, the cost is $O(M^2\delta_E)$. Since there are N hop counts, the final cost is $O(NM^2\delta_E)$ time steps. \square

6 Conclusion and Perspectives

With respect to communication networks, one of the hypothesis used in this paper is that during the routing procedure, if a node which have already received the message disappears and then reappears, then the message remains valid in its memory and the node can again participate in the routing (this hypothesis is somewhat analogous to *parking allowed* in [20]).

However, in networks where nodes have small batteries, if a node disappears and then reappears, it may have lost the received messages. We can tackle this case by building another evolving graph \mathcal{G}' with duplicated nodes and single presence interval vertices, along with a node schedule P'_V for $V_{\mathcal{G}}$ which states which are the copies of the old nodes. The complexities of Algorithms 1 and 3 for foremost journeys and shortest journeys increase by a factor proportional to the node activity and become $O(M\delta_V(\log\delta_E + \log N))$ and $O(M\delta_V\log\delta_E)$, respectively, whereas the complexity of Algorithm 5 for fastest journeys, which is based on the number of edge presence intervals, increases to $O(NM^2\delta_V^2\delta_E)$. For details, see [3].

The fact that the evolving graphs are timed and, further, that the edge traversal times are continuous, turns the computation of shortest journeys more difficult than in usual graphs, and also makes the computation of fastest journeys quite intricate. Only the computation of foremost journeys can be inspired by usual shortest paths computations, and that is probably the explanation why this problem had received considerable attention in the literature.

Evolving graphs may trigger several new insights in the study of wireless, optical, mobile, or fixed dynamic networks, opening wide new ways for further research.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Balazs Kotnyek for bringing several references to our attention. We also thank Hervé Rivano for continuous help and motivation.

References

- [1] S. Bhadra and A. Ferreira. Computing multicast trees in dynamic networks using evolving graphs. Research Report 4531, INRIA, 2002.
- [2] A. Borodin and R. El-Yaniv. *Online computation and competitive analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [3] B. Bui Xuan, A. Ferreira and A. Jarry. Computing shortest, fastest, and foremost journeys in dynamic networks. Research Report 4589, INRIA, 2002. <http://www.inria.fr/rrrt/rr-4589.html>.
- [4] T. Cormen, C. Leiserson, and R. Rivest. *Introduction to Algorithms*. The MIT Press, 1990.
- [5] S.E. Dreyfus. An appraisal of Some Shortest-Path Algorithms. *Operations Research*, 17:269–271, 1969.
- [6] A. Ferreira. On models and algorithms for dynamic communication networks: The case for evolving graphs. In *Proceedings of 4^e rencontres francophones sur les Aspects Algorithmiques des Télécommunications (ALGOTEL'2002)*, pages 155–161, Mèze, France, May 2002. INRIA Press.
- [7] A. Faragó and V.R. Syrotiuk. MERIT: A unified framework for routing protocol assessment in mobile ad hoc networks. In *Proc. ACM Mobicom 01* pages 53–60, 2001.
- [8] A. Ferreira, J. Galtier, and P. Penna. Topological design, routing and handover in satellite networks. In I. Stojmenovic, editor, *Handbook of Wireless Networks and Mobile Computing*, pages 473–493. John Wiley and Sons, 2002.
- [9] L. Fleisher and Martin Skutella. The quickest multi-commodity flow problem. In *Proc. of IPCO'02*, 2002.
- [10] L.R. Ford and D.R. Fulkerson. Constructing maximal dynamic flows from static flows. *Operations Research*, 6:419–433, 1958.
- [11] L.R. Ford and D.R. Fulkerson. *Flows in Networks*. Princeton University Press, 1962.
- [12] J. Halpern. Shortest route with time dependent length of edges and limited delay possibilities in nodes. *Zeitschrift für Operations Research*, 21:117–124, 1977.
- [13] J. Halpern and I. Priess. Shortest path with time constraints on movement and parking. *Networks*, 4:241–253, 1974.
- [14] P. Haxell, A. Rasala, G. Wilfong, and P. Winkler. Wide-sense nonblocking WDM cross-connects. In R. Möhring and R. Raman, editors, *Proceedings of ESA 2002*, volume 2461 of *LNCS*, pages 538–550, Rome, Italy, September 2002. Springer-Verlag.
- [15] E. Köhler, K. Langkau, and M. Skutella. Time-expanded graphs for flow-dependent transit times. In *proc. ESA'02*, 2002.
- [16] E. Köhler and M. Skutella. Flows over time with load-dependent transit times. In *Proc. of the 13th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 174–183, 2002.
- [17] A. Orda and R. Rom. Shortest-path and minimum-delay algorithms in network with time-dependent edge length. *Journal of the ACM*, 37, pages 607–625, 1990.
- [18] A. Orda and R. Rom. Minimum weight paths in time-dependent networks. *Networks*, 21, pages 295–320, 1991.
- [19] S. Pallottino and M.G. Scutellà. Shortest path algorithms in transportation models: classical and innovative aspects. In (P. Marcotte and S. Nguyen, eds.) *Equilibrium and Advanced Transportation Modelling*, pages 245–281, 1998.
- [20] A.B. Philpott. Continuous-time flows in networks. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 4(15):640–661, 1990.
- [21] C. Scheideler. Models and techniques for communication in dynamic networks. In H. Alt and A. Ferreira, editors, *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, volume 2285, pages 27–49. Springer-Verlag, March 2002.
- [22] I. Stojmenovic, editor. *Handbook of Wireless Networks and Mobile Computing*. John Wiley & Sons, February 2002.
- [23] L. Viennot. Routage entre robots dont les déplacements sont connus – Un exemple de graphe dynamique. Réunion TAROT, ENST, Paris, November 2001.